



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/560,373	04/28/2000	Gregory Lucius Meredith	MS147248.1	3570

27195	7590	09/14/2007
AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP		
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER		
1900 EAST NINTH STREET		
CLEVELAND, OH 44114		

EXAMINER	
KISS, ERIC B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/14/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
osteuball@thepatentattorneys.com

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/560,373	MEREDITH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eric B. Kiss	2192	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Eric B. Kiss. (3) _____

(2) Nilesh S. Amin (Reg. No. 58,407). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 06 September 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1 (proposed), 7, and 28.

Identification of prior art discussed: Template.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Amin proposed an amendment to claim 1, further describing the nature of the child interdependent transactions. The examiner indicated that as long as the amendments only describe the processes themselves in conceptual terms, the claims would not appear to distinguish over the prior art in terms of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The examiner indicated that the additional limitations did not appear to require any specific modeling means/technique and that an existing process matching the pattern in the claims could easily be imagined (the examiner described, for example, the process of mailing a letter as comprising several independent and interdependent transactions). The examiner further described how the Template reference met the new limitations. Mr. Amin suggested that the nature of the transactions in the claim allows for selective roll back, but admitted that this feature is not presently claimed. Mr. Amin indicated that he would add such rollback features to the claims in the formal response, and would likewise amend independent claims 7 and 28. Once again (see Notice of Non-compliance (04/06/2007),) the examiner indicated that the proposed amendments to claim 7 and 28 would violate 37 CFR 1.121 and would fail to address the previous concerns over unduly broad language in the claims.

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

FACSIMILE

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MANY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY, AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ADDRESS LISTED BELOW VIA UNITED STATES MAIL. THANK YOU.

Date: 9/5/07

TO: Examiner Kiss

FACSIMILE NO.: 571-273-3699

FROM: Nilesh S. Amin
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24th Floor, National City Center
1900 East 9th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Telephone: (216) 696-8730
Facsimile: (216) 696-8731

No. of Pages Including Cover 2

RE: Application Serial No. 09/560,373
Filed: April 28, 2000

Dear Examiner Kiss,

I am faxing you an interview request form for application number 09/560373. I would like to set up an interview this week or early next week that is convenient for you to discuss this case. Please call me at 310-428-4640, at your earliest convenience to let me know when you are available to discuss this case.

Regards,
Nilesh Amin
Reg. No. 58,407

/EBK/

09/06/2007

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

PTOL-413A (06-07)
Approved for use through 06/30/2007. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/560,373 First Named Applicant: Lucius G. Meredith
Examiner: Eric B. Kiss Art Unit: 2192 Status of Application: Pending Non-Final

Tentative Participants:

(1) Nilesh S. Amin, Reg No. 58407 (2) _____
(3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: Between 8/29-9/6 when Examiner is available Proposed Time: Anytime (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Claim rejections 35 USC 103</u>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Applicant's representative would like clarify understanding of Examiner's interpretation of the prior art w/respect to claims.

Applicant's representative would like to present claim amendments and associated arguments that are believed

to overcome the objections and rejections. A Draft version of a Reply can be faxed to Examiner prior to the interview.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Nilesh S. Amin

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Nilesh S. Amin

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

58407

Registration Number, if applicable

Examiner/SPE Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

FACSIMILE

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MANY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY, AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ADDRESS LISTED BELOW VIA UNITED STATES MAIL. THANK YOU.

Date: 9/5/07

TO: Examiner Kiss

FACSIMILE NO.: 571-273-3699

FROM: Nilesh S. Amin
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24th Floor, National City Center
1900 East 9th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Telephone: (216) 696-8730
Facsimile: (216) 696-8731

No. of Pages Including Cover 14

RE: Application Serial No. 09/560,373
Filed: April 28, 2000

Dear Examiner Kiss,

I am faxing you a draft Reply to the Office Action dated 6/7/07 for application number 09/560,373 that we can use as a basis for discussion during our interview on Thursday 9/6/07 at 2pm ET. I will call you at 571-272-3699 at the designated date/time.

Regards,
Nilesh Amin
Reg. No. 58,407

/EBK/

09/06/2007

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT**PATENT****MS147248.01/MSFTP101US****CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being submitted via the USPTO EFS Filing System on the date shown below to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date: _____

/Jessica Sexton/
Jessica Sexton**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re patent application of:

Applicant(s): Lucius G. Meredith, *et al.*

Examiner: Eric B. Kiss

Serial No: 09/560,373

Art Unit: 2192

Filing Date: April 28, 2000

Title: MODEL FOR BUSINESS WORKFLOW PROCESSES

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

DRAFT REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION DATED JUNE 7, 2007

Dear Sir:

Favorable reconsideration of the above-identified patent application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and comments below.

/EBK/

09/06/2007

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

09/560,373

MS147248.01/MSFTP101US

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

1. (Currently Amended) A computer-implemented method for facilitating long-running transactions of a business workflow process, comprising:
 - reducing a business process to XML code of a scheduling programming language;
 - dividing the reduced business process into at least one independent transaction and at least one parent transaction, the at least one independent transaction is not interdependent with the at least one parent transaction, the at least one parent transaction has two or more child interdependent transactions that are each different from each other and interdependent with each other, each child transaction receiving data that is at least partially different from data received by the other child transactions, the child transactions are children of the parent transaction, the child interdependent transaction are dependent on each other for completion;
 - executing the at least one independent transaction independently from the at least one parent transaction to increase throughput and decrease latency of the business process, the at least one independent transaction commits upon successful execution;
 - executing the child interdependent transactions concurrently ~~independently from each other,~~ the at least one parent interdependent transaction commits after all child interdependent transaction have committed ; and
 - transferring committed data associated with the at least one independent transaction and the at least one parent transaction to a computer component for further processing.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

09/560,373

MS147248.01/MSFTP101US

2. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, the child interdependent transactions respectively include one or more actions, the one or more actions are concurrently executed independently from each other.
3. (Previously presented) The method of claim 2, respective child interdependent transactions commit when all of their associated actions are completed.
4. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising explicitly defining transaction boundaries for the at least one independent transaction and the child interdependent transactions as a function of a number of actions within the at least one independent transaction and the child interdependent transactions, respectively, in order to define a granularity at an action level.
5. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, the child interdependent transactions are concurrently executed in isolation from each other.
6. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising employing separate machines to execute the at least one independent transaction and the at least one parent transaction.
7. (Previously Presented) A system that uses an XML-based programming language for facilitating implementation of business processes within a computer-readable medium, the components comprising:
- a user interface component; and
 - a plurality of model components accessible through the user interface component, the plurality of model components allows a user to create a model of a business process and reduce the model *via* the XML-based programming language, the plurality of model components comprises a distinguishing model component that distinguishes between autonomous business operations and interdependent business operations, the autonomous business operations are not dependent on each other for completion and are concurrent

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

09/560,373

MS147248.01/MSFTP101US

with respect to each other, the interdependent business operations are dependent on each other for completion and are concurrent with respect to each other, the interdependent business operations being non-identical and each receiving data that is at least partially different from each other.

8. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 7, further comprising a transaction grouping component that groups business operations into interdependent business operations .
9. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 8, the transaction grouping component provides synchronization of interdependent business operations based on completion of the interdependent business operations .
10. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 7, further comprising an action grouping component that groups business operations into interdependent business operations .
11. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 10, the action grouping component provides synchronization of interdependent business operations based on completion of the interdependent business operations .
12. (Previously presented) The system of claim 7, the plurality of components further comprising at least one boundary establishing component that defines transaction boundaries.
13. (Previously presented) The system of claim 12, the at least one boundary establishing component includes a component that establishes concurrent operations.
14. (Previously presented) The system of claim 12, the at least one boundary establishing component includes a component for establishing sequential operations.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

09/560,373

MS147248.01/MSFTP101US

/EBK/

09/06/2007

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

15. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 12, further comprising a compensation component that compensates committed interdependent business operations and is invoked upon the occurrence of a failed interdependent business operations.
16. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 15, the interdependent business operations are children operations in a parent operation, wherein the compensation component is invoked by the parent operation .
17. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 15, the compensation component calls compensation routines within the committed interdependent business operations.
18. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 15, the compensation component calls compensation routines within the failed interdependent business operations.
19. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 18, the compensation routines utilize information within the committed interdependent business operations.
20. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 15, the compensation component calls compensation routines within the failed interdependent business operations based on information on the committed interdependent business operations stored within a database.
21. (Previously presented) The system of claim 13, the computer readable medium resides on a computer system.
22. (Previously presented) The system of claim 7, the plurality of components further comprising a component that defines concurrent synchronizing constraints as occurring upon completion of the autonomous operations.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

09/560,373

MS147248.01/MSFTP101US

23-27. (Cancelled)

28. (Previously Presented) A system that uses a scheduling programming language for representing business operations, comprising:

means for distinguishing between synchronization of autonomous operations from interdependent operations, the autonomous operations are not dependent on each other for completion and are concurrent with respect to each other, the interdependent operations are dependent on each other for completion and are concurrent with respect to each other, the autonomous operations and the interdependent concurrent are represented in the scheduling programming language, the scheduling programming language based at least in part on XML, the interdependent operations each receive data that is at least partially dissimilar with respect to data received by each interdependent operation;

means for expressing synchronization constraints on completion of autonomous operations; and

means for allowing association of transaction operations and groups of business operations.

29. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising failing the at least one parent transaction when at least one of its child interdependent transactions does not commit, and compensating the at least one failed child interdependent transaction.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

09/560,373

MS147248.01/MSFTP101US

30. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 29, the at least one parent transaction invokes a compensation routine within the at least one failed child interdependent transaction that compensates the at least one failed child interdependent transaction.

31. (Previously presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising compensating the at least one independent transaction when at least one of the child interdependent transactions does not commit.

32. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising compensating the at least one parent transaction when it does not commit and all of its child interdependent transactions commit.

33. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 32, the at least one parent transaction invokes its own compensation routine.

/EBK/

09/06/2007

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

09/560,373

MS147248.01/MSFTP101US

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 and 28-33 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claim 1 has been amended as shown at page 2 of the Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-14, 21, 22 and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-14, 21, 22 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Release 8.0 of the Workflow Template software product ("Template") publicly available from Template Software, Inc. in 1998 as evidenced by "Using the WFT Development Environment", 1998 (hereinafter *UsingWFT*) and "Developing a WFT Workflow System," 1998 (hereinafter *DevelWFT*) in view of "XML based Process Management Standard launched by Workflow management Coalition - 'WF-XML'," July 7, 1999 [online], accessed 01/03/2006, Workflow Management Coalition, URL:<http://www.wfmc.org/pr/pr1999-07-07.pdf>, 4 pages(hereinafter referred to as *WFXML-99*). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. The Template(*UsingWFT* and *DevelWFT*) and *WFXML-99* documents, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation recited in the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

09/560,373

MS147248.01/MSFTP101US

applicant's disclosure. *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a system and method for modeling business workflow processes and reducing the processes to a useful programming language for use in real world applications. To this end, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 7 and 28) recites: *dividing the reduced business process into at least one independent transaction and at least one parent transaction, the at least one independent transaction is not interdependent with the at least one parent transaction, the at least one parent transaction has two or more child interdependent transactions that are each different from each other and interdependent with each other, each child transaction receiving data that is at least partially different from data received by the other child transactions, the child transactions are children of the parent transaction, the child interdependent transaction are dependent on each other for completion; ... executing the child interdependent transactions concurrently, the at least one parent interdependent transaction commits after all child interdependent transaction have committed*. Template(UsingWFT and DevelWFT) and WFXML-99, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest these exemplary features of applicants' claimed subject matter.

Template discloses a Workflow Design Editor (WDE) that enables one to design a workflow system at a high level. In particular, the Office Action asserts that the Template- UsingWFT and DevelWFT discloses a copy flow and a compound flow that together disclose concurrently executing interdependent child transactions. However, the cited features disclose parallel tasks, but fails to provide any discussion if interdependence between the tasks. The subject claim recites that the interdependent child transactions are dependent on each other for completion. The cited example discloses two tasks, Approve Fund and Check Inventory, which are not dependent on each other for completion. In fact, they are tasks that are completed by two separate individuals that are completely independent of each other and do not require any information from each other to complete their tasks. Therefore, the tasks are independent

/EBK/

09/06/2007

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

09/560,373

MS147248.01/MSFTP101US

tasks, not interdependent, that can each complete independently of each other. In fact, Template is in fact silent regarding committing transactions. Having various points where transactions commit allows for error processing by rolling back a transaction(s) to earlier commit points or executing error processing routines. Template does not discuss these concepts. Furthermore, the Office Action attempts to equate the Install Solution task as a parent task to the Approve Fund and Check Inventory tasks. However, the Install Solution task is not a parent task to these tasks. It is a subsequent task that merely waits for data to be sent from each of the Approve Fund and Check Inventory tasks before it begins execution. The subject claim discloses a parent transaction that has two more interdependent child transactions and the parent task commits upon the last child transaction committing. Template fails to discuss the concept of a parent task that is made up of child tasks, as well as, a parent task that commits separately from its child tasks. By providing flexible transaction grouping and commit points, the subject claim allows for more robust data reporting and error processing capabilities that are not contemplated in the cited references. Moreover, the Examiner contends that Template-UsingWFT provides a copy flow facility that divides a reduced business process into at least one independent transaction and at least one parent interdependent transaction. While the copy flow facility appears to provide for dividing a reduced business process into transactions, it is submitted that the cited document, and specifically, the copy flow facility, does not teach or suggest sending disparate work items to the destination tasks as taught in the subject claims. Rather the cited document specifically states "[a] copy flow is a single flow that splits into two or more flows. ... An exact copy of the work item or work item set is sent to each destination task." (See page 3-20). The facility is incapable of dividing the parent transaction into one or more different child interdependent transactions each receiving different data. As evidenced by the above cited passage, the cited art sends the same data to each child interdependent transaction. Template is silent regarding divided workflows to transactions that are not receiving identical work items. The Office Action attempts to introduce the manager's name and approval date as evidence of receiving disparate data in the work items. However, this data is not part of the received work item of the Approve Requisition task. It is instead part of the work

/EBK/

09/06/2007

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

09/560,373

MS147248.01/MSFTP101US

item that is sent out of the Approve Requisition task. The claimed subject matter in contrast is capable of dividing a reduced business transaction into a plurality of independent transactions and one or more parent transactions wherein the one or more parent transactions can comprise a plurality of differing child interdependent transactions that each receives data that is different from data received by the each of the other child interdependent transactions.

Moreover the Examiner offers WFXML-99 to make up for the acknowledged deficiency that Template does not teach or suggest reducing a business process to XML code of a scheduling programming language. However, WFXML-99 does not cure the elucidated deficiency with respect to Template in regards to independent claims 1, 7 and 28 as discussed above concerning the novel feature, *child interdependent transactions that are each different from each other and interdependent with each other, each child transaction receiving data that is at least partially different from data received by the other child transactions, the child transactions are children of the parent transaction, the child interdependent transaction are dependent on each other for completion; ... executing the child interdependent transactions concurrently, the at least one parent interdependent transaction commits after all child interdependent transaction have committed.* WFXML-99 provides a draft specification relating to the provision of XML-based exchanges between workflow systems. The cited reference is silent regarding these novel features of the subject claims.

In view of at least the foregoing, applicant's representative respectfully submits that Template(UsingWFT and DevelWFT) and WFXML-99, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of applicant's invention as recited in independent claims 1, 7 and 28 (and claims 1-6, 8-14, 21 and 22 that respectfully depend there from), and thus fails to make obvious the subject claimed invention. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 15-20 and 29-33 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 15-20 and 29-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Template in view of WFXML-99, as applied to claims 1 and 12 above,

/EBK/

09/06/2007

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

09/560,373

MS147248.01/MSFTP101US

and further in view of Chen *et al.* (US 5,940,839). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 15-20 and 29-33 depend from independent claims 7 and 28 respectively, and Chen *et al.* does not remedy the aforementioned deficiencies with respect to the Template(UsingWFT and DevelWFT) and WFXML-99 and the respective independent claims. Chen *et al.* relates to systems and methods for recovering from failures in transactions in nested transactional structures. The cited document, however does not teach or suggest child interdependent transactions that are each different from each other and dependent on each other for completion, wherein each child transaction receives data that is at least partially different from data received by the other child transactions, or that the parent transaction commits when a last child interdependent transaction commits. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

/EBK/

09/06/2007

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

09/560,373

MS147248.01/MSFTP101US

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP101US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731

/EBK/

09/06/2007

ATTACHMENT TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY